



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/674,173	10/27/2000	Martin John Ellis	36-1397	3039

7590 02/19/2004

Nixon & Vanderhye
1100 North Glebe Road 8th Floor
Arlington, VA 22201-4714

EXAMINER

MOSLEHI, FARHOOD

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2154

DATE MAILED: 02/19/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/674,173

Applicant(s)

ELLIS ET AL.

Examiner

Farhood Moslehi

Art Unit

2154

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 October 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-11 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hellemans et al. ("TINA Service Architecture: From Specification to Implementation") (hereinafter Hellemans).

As per claim 1, Hellemans clearly shows a telecommunications service session control system comprising at least one server and in use interacting with software objects derived from an application programming interface, said application programming interface comprising:

A first framework object class for deriving service specific object classes to be instantiated on a client machine during participation in a service session (e.g. page 176, col. 1, lines 17-20);

A second framework object class for deriving service specific object classes to be instantiated on a server during a service session, said second class representing said service session (e.g. page 176, col. 2, lines 1-4); and a third framework object class for deriving service specific object classes to be instantiated on a server during

Art Unit: 2154

participation in a service session, said third class representing said participation (e.g. page 176, col. 1, lines 6-14).

4. As per claim 2, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

5. As per claim 3, Hellemans clearly shows a system wherein said second class comprising methods intended to be overridden in said service specific object classes, said methods being for receiving calls from said system indicating changes in participant status during a service session (e.g. page 175, Figure 2. The C++ methods for receiving calls all can be overridden).

6. As per claim 4, Hellemans clearly shows a system wherein said third class comprising methods intended to be overridden in said service specific object classes, said methods being responsive to messages from said system indicating changes in participant status during a service session (e.g. page 175, Figure 2. Dynamic C++ implementation class contains methods and they are overridden as part of the systems' implementation).

7. As per claim 5, Hellemans clearly shows a system wherein said second class comprises a method for identifying characteristics of a plurality of service specific objects derived from said third class and instantiated during a service session (e.g. page 181, section 5.3).

8. As per claim 6, Hellemans clearly shows a system wherein said third class comprises a method for identifying characteristics of a plurality of service specific objects derived from said third class and instantiated during a service session (e.g. page 181, section 5.3).

9. As per claim 7, Hellemans clearly shows a server comprising a data store wherein the server being arranged to transmit the application programming interface request (e.g. page 181, col. 1, lines 1-8).

10. Claims 8-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Genette et al. ("Intelligent network: the service creation environment") (hereinafter Genette).

11. As per claim 8, Genette clearly shows a service development system for generating service specific application parts to be implemented in a distributed manner in a telecommunications service session control system, said system comprising:

A service component constructor:

For storing data defining a plurality of framework components to be distributed between a client station and a server, and a plurality of customization components for customizing said framework components in a service-specific manner (e.g. page 14, col. 3, lines 10-22); for generating data defining a first user interface for representing said framework components and said customization components as icons on a visual display means (e.g. page 14, insert 1); and for defining relationships between said framework components and said customization components to generate customized components by operations on said first user interface (e.g. page 15, col. 2, lines 18-27); a control system simulator for simulating the interfaces and functionality provided by said telecommunications service session control system (e.g. page 17, col. 3, lines 1-9); and a service tester: for generating interactions between said control system simulator and said customized components (e.g. page 19, col. 1, lines 19-37); and for generating data defining a second user interface for representing participation in a service via said

Art Unit: 2154

telecommunications service session control system, on a visual display means, in response to said interactions (e.g. page 16, col. 2, lines 20-35).

12. As per claim 9, Genette clearly shows a system, wherein said data defining a second user interface represents a plurality of participants in said service session (e.g. page 15, col. 2, lines 3-10).

13. As per claim 10, Genette clearly shows a system, wherein said service tester is responsive to user input to specify the number of said participants (e.g. page 19, col. 1, lines 20-30).

As per claim 11, Genette shows a system, wherein said service tester is responsive to user input to specify the state of participation of a participant in said service session (e.g. page 19, col. 1, lines 30-41. It is inherent within the tester tool, to evaluate the state of participant after a service session has been established).

Conclusion

14. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Patent Number US 6,041,325 to Shah et al.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Farhood Moslehi whose telephone number is 703-305-8646. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on 703-305-8498. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-746-7239.

Art Unit: 2154

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-306-5484.

fm



JOHN FOLLANSBEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
PATENT CENTER 2100